

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/770,279
Attorney Docket No.: Q62411

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 6, 11, and 21 to further clarify the invention.

Preliminary Matter

As a preliminary matter, the Examiner has not returned the completely initialed PTO/SB/08 for the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 11, 2003. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to initial and return form PTO/SB/08 filed on August 11, 2003.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-21 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-15, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,230,170 to Zellweger et al. (hereinafter "Zellweger") in view of a newly found reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,211,856 to Choi et al. (hereinafter "Choi"), claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zellweger and Choi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,761 to Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter "Kanevsky"), and claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Zellweger and Choi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,230,063 to Hoeber et al. (hereinafter Hoeber). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds for rejections in view of the following comments.

Zellweger and Choi

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-15, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zellweger in view of Choi.

Independent claim 1, among a number of unique features, recites: “means for displaying additional information for said selected element in said enlarged, corresponding display area... wherein each of the plurality of elements comprises at least one sub-element that the user can manipulate and that relates to a setting of a device, and wherein said additional information comprises said at least one sub-element.” For example, in an illustrative, non-limiting embodiment, once an element is selected, additional information (sub-elements) are displayed. The user can set parameters or values such as printing conditions in a sub-element while referring to the elements that are not selected such as values for other elements that were already set.

The Examiner alleges that claim 1 is obvious in view of the combined teachings of Zellweger and Choi. In particular, the Examiner alleges that Zellweger’s annotation tag that may be expanded is an element that the user can manipulate (*see* page 2 of the Office Action). The Examiner acknowledges that Zellweger does not disclose sub-elements relating to a setting of a device. The Examiner, however, alleges that Choi cures the deficient teachings of Zellweger. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Choi only discloses *magnifying* the displayed icons that may be used to control a consumer device. Choi, however, fails to disclose or suggest displaying *additional* information that relates to the set up of the device. In Choi, *when the item is selected, the element is simply magnified*. Choi does not disclose or suggest displaying additional information relating to the

setting of the device when an element (*e.g.*, a TV remote control) is selected. In short, Choi does not disclose or suggest that when an icon is selected, displaying additional information that relates to the setting of the device.

That is, the combined teachings of Zellweger and Choi, taken alone or in any conceivable combination fail to disclose or suggest “means for displaying additional information for said selected element in said enlarged, corresponding display area... wherein each of the plurality of elements comprises at least one sub-element that the user can manipulate and that relates to a setting of a device and wherein said additional information comprises said at least one sub-element,” as set forth in claim 1. For at least this exemplary reason, independent claim 1 is patentable over the combined teachings of Zellweger and Choi. Therefore, it is appropriate and necessary for the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 1. Claims 2, 4, 5, and 19-21 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

In addition, dependent claim 20 recites: “in the at least one sub-element, the user sets at least one parameter by manually inputting a value for the parameter or by selecting the value that is displayed in the display area.” The Examiner alleges that Choi’s item 30 of Fig. 2b discloses the sub-element in which one or more parameter may be set (*see* page 7 of the Office Action). Choi’s item 30 of Fig. 2b, however is a GUI touch-screen display (col. 3, lines 38 to 40). If the annotation tags of Zellweger are replaced with the GUI touch-screen displays of Choi, the combination is unworkable (a display area showing text and having GUIs) and at the very least clearly modifies the principle operations of Zellweger. If, on the other hand, a button depicted in Fig. 2b of Choi allegedly discloses a sub-element, then the value is not set in the button. For at

least these additional reasons, claim 20 is patentable over the combined teachings of Zellweger and Choi.

Claims 6, 11, and 12 recite similar features to the features argued above with respect to claim 1. Since claims 6, 11, and 12 contain features that are similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, the features argued above with respect to claim 1, those arguments are respectfully submitted to apply with equal force here. For at least substantially analogous reasons, claims 6, 11, and 12 are patentable over the combined teachings of Zellweger and Choi. Moreover, claims 7, 9, and 10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 6, and claims 13-15 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 12.

Zellweger, Choi, and Kanevsky

Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zellweger and Choi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,761 to Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter “Kanevsky”). It was already demonstrated that Zellweger and Choi do not meet all the requirements of independent claim 1. Kanevsky is relied upon only for its teaching of adjusting the size of the display areas. Clearly, Kanevsky does not cure the deficient teachings of Zellweger and Choi.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the references in a manner suggested by the Examiner. Zellweger relates to displaying supporting annotations along with the main text. The level of the annotation is displayed to the user by indenting or by positioning the annotation text and not by adjusting the size of the text. For example, in Zellweger, the main text is displayed without any indentation; the first level of

supporting text (annotation) is displayed with a one indentation; the second level with an additional level of indentation and so on, whereas the size is only adjusted to make room for the additional supporting text that needs to be displayed. Kanevsky, on the other hand, arranges icons based on relatedness.

One of ordinary skill in the art, confronted with a problem of improving the representation of supporting text (annotations) would not have turned to Kanevsky's teachings of arranging icons. Different considerations should be addressed when designing a display for presenting text versus menu icons. Moreover, since in Zellweger, the relatedness is displayed with indentations, there is no motivation to display relatedness with size. In other words, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Zellweger's teachings by Kanevsky's teachings of fractal arrangements to show relatedness.

Clearly, Kanevsky does not compensate for the above-identified deficiencies of Zellweger and Choi. Together, the combined teachings of these references would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter of claims 1 and 6. Since claims 3 and 8 are dependent upon claim 1 and 6, respectively, they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Zellweger, Choi, and Hoeber

Dependent claims 16-18 stand rejected as being obvious over Zellweger in view of Choi and Hoeber. Claims 16-18 depend on claims 12, 1, and 6, respectively. It was already demonstrated that Zellweger and Choi fail to teach or suggest all the recitations of the independent claims 1, 6, and 12. Hoeber is only cited for its teaching of a push pin and as such

clearly fails to cure the deficient teachings of Zellweger and Choi. Therefore, claims 16-18 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 12, 1, and 6, respectively.

Moreover, claim 16 is patentable for at least the following additional reason. Dependent claim 16 recites: “piercing a setting pin to a display area corresponding to an element thereby preventing enlargement and reduction of said display area upon further selections.” The Examiner acknowledges that Zellweger and Choi do not disclose or suggest a piercing pin, as set forth in claim 16 (see page 8 of the Office Action). The Examiner, however, alleges that Hoeber cures the deficient teachings of Zellweger and Choi. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that since the menu window 120 is depicted in Fig. 3C without the resizing corners 90-93, it cannot be resized.

Hoeber, however, discloses that “the menu 120 may be manipulated on the display like any other window” (col. 7, lines 41 to 48). Manipulation of other windows, *e.g.*, the window 80, includes resizing. In other words, in Hoeber, the pinning of the window only prevents the window from disappearing from the display. In Hoeber, however, this menu window 120 can still be resized. In short, Hoeber fails to cure the deficient teachings of Zellweger and Choi. For at least this additional reason, it is appropriate and necessary for the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 16.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/770,279
Attorney Docket No.: Q62411

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 14, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: Q62411